Appl. No. 10/644,936
Reply dated October 24, 2006
Response to Office Action Mailed July 24, 2006

Docket No. NIT-391

REMARKS

Claims 26, 31 and 34 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled by this amendment. Accordingly, claims 26-37 are currently pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claim 34 was objected to due to a grammatical error. Claim 34 has been amended to correct the error. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to claim 34.

35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 26, 27, 31, 32, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Davies et al., US Pat. No. 6,853,634 (hereafter "Davies"). Claims 28-30, 33 and 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies and further in view of Abdelaziz et al., US Application Pub. No. 20030041141 (hereafter "Abdelaziz"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for the reasons set forth below.

Under the invention, a first computer receives, from a third computer, a request for executing one or more first programs. The first computer determines whether or not the one or more first programs correspond to a second program on

the basis of an association between the first program and the second program

previously stored. The first computer sends a second request to the second

program when the first program corresponds to the second program, receives the

results of the second request from the second program, and sends the results to the

third computer in response to the first request. Thus, the invention provides a

system whereby a second program on a second computer that is not disclosed to a

third computer produces results for a the first program that is under disclosure to the

third computer, so that results are returned by the first computer to the third

computer as if the first computer produced the results by execution of the first

program, and the third computer does not know of or need to know of the second

program or the second computer.

Davies, on the other hand, provides a presence management system 10 that

allows connections between watching parties 12 and watched parties 13 to be

managed in a multiple access communications network (see Davies col. 6, lines 10-

19). If a watching party desires to contact a watched party, a contact request is sent

to the presence management system (col. 6, line 59-61). In order to make the

contact request, the watching party does not need to know any of the watched

party's direct contact details, but instead, the presence management system

identifier for the watched party is used (col. 6, line 66 through col. 7, line 2). When

the presence management system receives a contact request from a watching party,

the presence management system determines whether the required watched party is

available for contact (col. 7, lines 13-15). The presence management system provides information about this to the watching party that made the request (col. 7, lines 15-16).

Thus, Davies discloses that a presence management system receives a request from a watching party for a connection with a watched party, and a connection address or other identification information of the watched party is provided under controlled conditions. Accordingly, Davies merely discloses that the presence management system determines whether to execute a request for connection between a watched party and a watching party. The target of the request is not the management system itself, but is instead the watched party, since the requesting watching party has to already know of the existence of the watched party that is the subject of the request.

On the other hand, according to Applicants' invention set forth in independent claims 26 and 31, the first request is sent from the third computer to a first program on the first computer, and the second computer and second program are not disclosed to the third computer. The first computer determines whether to send a request to the second computer according to an association between the first program and the second program stored on the first computer. Thus, under Applicants' invention, the first computer identifies the second computer and a second program for sending a second request, whereas in Davies, the watching party itself identifies the watched party to be contacted.

In Applicants invention, the first computer receives the results from the

second program on the second computer and returns these results to the third

computer in response to the first request that the third computer made to the first

program. Thus, the third computer only knows that it made the first request to the

first program on the first computer and received a response from the first computer.

The third computer does not need to know anything about the second program or the

second computer. In Davies, on the other hand, the watching party itself directs the

presence management system to contact the watched party to determine availability

of the watched party. Thus, Davies fails to teach any means for achieving an

advantage of the present invention whereby the third computer has no knowledge of

the second program or second computer, even though the second program provides

the actual results. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims

26 and 31 are allowable over Davies.

Additionally, under Applicants' independent claim 34, a first processor is able

to execute a first program and a second processor is able to execute a second

program. The first processor, the second processor and a third processor are

coupled to a network for communication. A fourth processor is coupled to the

network and determines an association between the first program and the second

program, stores an association information indicating the association between the

first program and the second program, receives an inquiry of a location where one of

the first or second programs is executed from the third processor via the network, determines which location of execution of the first program or the associated second program is to be sent, and sends back to the third processor the determined location of execution of the first or second program.

Davies provides no teaching of a system having a fourth processor that determines an association between a first program executable by a first processor and a second program executable by a second processor. Rather, Davies teaches that inputs from the communication network are provided in the form of event gateways 53 (see col. 14, lines 27-29). Event gateways receive raw data from access networks, pre-process this data, and pass it on to the raw presence manager of the presence management system (col. 15, lines 62-65). Event gateways produce a time-ordered series of location data events that have been filtered and homogenized so that only information about users that are being tracked by the presence system is passed to the raw presence manager (col. 16, lines 4-8).

However, the event gateways of Davies do not determine an association between a first program able to be executed by a first processor and a second program able to be executed by a second processor, as required by claim 34. Rather, the event gateways merely provide information on events to the presence management system. Further, the event gateways make no determination of which location of execution of the first program or the associated second program is to be sent to a third processor in response to a request, as also required by claim 34.

Appl. No. 10/644,936
Reply dated October 24, 2006
Response to Office Action Mailed July 24, 2006

Docket No. NIT-391

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 34 is also patentable over Davies.

Abdelaziz fails to make up for the shortcomings of Davies discussed above. Abdelaziz teaches a decentralized mechanism for detecting presence of entities in a peer-to-peer network. Information about programming interfaces and functionality of software modules may be provided independently of protocols and behaviors that may be used to implement the software modules (see Abdelaziz, par. 253). Identifiers may be used to describe and identify software modules, such as services and applications, in a hierarchical manner (see par. 254). Software modules interacting locally may express their dependencies via their respective class identifiers regardless of the particular execution environment (see par. 255). A tiered architecture may be used to define modules in the peer-to-peer environment (see par. 257).

Thus, Abdelaziz teaches a means for facilitating peer-to-peer communications by detecting the presence of users and other entities in a network environment. However, Abdelaziz fails to teach the features of the invention discussed above, including that a third computer sends a first request to a first program on a first computer, the first computer associates the first program with a second program on a second computer, and sends a second request to the second computer, and the first computer then passes results received from the second computer to the third

13

computer without disclosure of the second computer or second program to the third comptuer, as set forth in claims 26 and 31. Abdelaziz also fails to teach the determination of an association between a first program and a second program, or sending to a third processor a determined location of execution of the first or second program in response to a request, as set forth in claim 34. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 26, 31 and 34 are patentable over the combination of Davies and Abdelaziz.

The remaining claims depend from the claims discussed above, are directed to additional patentable features of the invention, and are allowable at least because they depend from allowable base claims.

Interview Summary

Applicants and Applicants' undersigned representative would like to thank the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor for the courtesy extended in conducting the in-person interview on October 17, 2006. During the interview, the invention and claims were discussed in relation to the prior art. Additionally, Applicants have amended independent claims 26 and 31 to more clearly set forth that the third computer does not know of or need to know of the second computer or second program, as discussed during the interview.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of

Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Colin D. Barnitz
Registration No. 35,061

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: October 24, 2006